

On global offensive k -alliances in graphs

Sergio Bermudo^{1,*}; Juan A. Rodríguez-Velázquez^{2,†}
 José M. Sigarreta^{3,‡} and Ismael G. Yero^{2,§}

¹Department of Economy, Quantitative Methods and Economic History
 Pablo de Olavide University, Carretera de Utrera Km. 1, 41013-Sevilla, Spain

²Department of Computer Engineering and Mathematics
 Rovira i Virgili University, Av. Països Catalans 26, 43007 Tarragona, Spain.

³ Faculty of Mathematics, Autonomous University of Guerrero
 Carlos E. Adame 5, Col. La Garita, Acapulco, Guerrero, México

Abstract

We investigate the relationship between global offensive k -alliances and some characteristic sets of a graph including r -dependent sets, τ -dominating sets and standard dominating sets. In addition, we discuss the close relationship that exist among the (global) offensive k_i -alliance number of Γ_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and the (global) offensive k -alliance number of $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$, for some specific values of k . As a consequence of the study, we obtain bounds on the global offensive k -alliance number in terms of several parameters of the graph.

*e-mail: sbernav@upo.es. Partially supported by Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, ref. BFM2003-00034 and Junta de Andalucía, ref. FQM-260 and ref. P06-FQM-02225.

†e-mail: juanalberto.rodriguez@urv.cat. Partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education through projects TSI2007-65406-C03-01 “E-AEGIS” and CONSOLIDER CSD2007-00004 “ARES” and by the Rovira i Virgili University through project 2006AIRE-09

‡e-mail: josemaria.sigarreta@uc3m.es

§e-mail: ismael.gonzalez@urv.cat

Keywords: Offensive alliances, dominating sets, dependent sets.

AMS Subject Classification numbers: 05C69

1 Introduction

The mathematical properties of alliances in graphs were first studied by P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi [6]. They proposed different types of alliances that have been extensively studied during the last four years. These types of alliances are called *defensive alliances* [6, 9, 10, 14], *offensive alliances* [3, 11, 15] and *dual alliances* or *powerful alliances* [1, 8]. A generalization of these alliances called *k-alliances* was presented by K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton [12, 13]. We are interested in the study of the mathematical properties of global offensive *k-alliances*.

We begin by stating the terminology used. Throughout this article, $\Gamma = (V, E)$ denotes a simple graph of order $|V| = n$. We denote two adjacent vertices u and v by $u \sim v$. For a nonempty set $S \subseteq V$, and a vertex $v \in V$, $N_S(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors v has in S : $N_S(v) := \{u \in S : u \sim v\}$, and the degree of v in S will be denoted by $\delta_S(v) = |N_S(v)|$. We denote the degree of a vertex $v \in V$ by $\delta(v)$, the minimum degree of Γ by δ and the maximum degree by Δ . The complement of the set S in V is denoted by $\overline{S}$ and the boundary of S is defined by $\partial(S) := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_{\overline{S}}(v)$.

A set $S \subseteq V$ is a *dominating set* in Γ if for every vertex $v \in \overline{S}$, $\delta_S(v) > 0$ (every vertex in $\overline{S}$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in S). The *domination number* of Γ , denoted by $\gamma(\Gamma)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in Γ . For $k \in \{2 - \Delta, \dots, \Delta\}$, a nonempty set $S \subseteq V$ is an *offensive k-alliance* in Γ if

$$\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\overline{S}}(v) + k, \quad \forall v \in \partial(S) \quad (1)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\delta(v) \geq 2\delta_{\overline{S}}(v) + k, \quad \forall v \in \partial(S). \quad (2)$$

It is clear that if $k > \Delta$, no set S satisfies (1) and, if $k < 2 - \Delta$, all the subsets of V satisfy it. An offensive *k-alliance* S is called *global* if it is a dominating set. The *offensive k-alliance number* of Γ , denoted by $a_k^o(\Gamma)$, is defined as the minimum cardinality of an offensive *k-alliance* in Γ . The *global offensive k-alliance number* of Γ , denoted by $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma)$, is defined as the minimum cardinality of a global offensive *k-alliance* in Γ . Notice that $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \geq a_k^o(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma_{k+1}^o(\Gamma) \geq \gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \geq \gamma(\Gamma)$.

In addition, if every vertex of Γ has even degree and k is odd, $k = 2l - 1$, then every global offensive $(2l - 1)$ -alliance in Γ is a global offensive $(2l)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case, $\gamma_{2l-1}^o(\Gamma) = \gamma_{2l}^o(\Gamma)$. Analogously, if every vertex of Γ has odd degree and k is even, $k = 2l$, then every global offensive $(2l)$ -alliance in Γ is a global offensive $(2l + 1)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case, $\gamma_{2l}^o(\Gamma) = \gamma_{2l+1}^o(\Gamma)$.

2 The global offensive k -alliance number for some families of graphs

The problem of finding the global offensive k -alliance number is NP-complete [5]. Even so, for some graphs it is possible to obtain this number. For instance, it is satisfied that for the family of the complete graphs, K_n , of order n

$$\gamma_k^o(K_n) = \left\lceil \frac{n + k - 1}{2} \right\rceil,$$

for any cycle, C_n , of order n

$$\gamma_k^o(C_n) = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil, & \text{for } k = 0, \\ \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil, & \text{for } k = 1, 2, \end{cases}$$

and for any path, P_n , of order n

$$\gamma_k^o(P_n) = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil, & \text{for } k = 0, \\ \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + k - 1, & \text{for } k = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.1. Let $\Gamma = K_{r,t}$ be a complete bipartite graph with $t \leq r$. For every $k \in \{2 - r, \dots, r\}$,

- (a) if $k \geq t + 1$, then $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = r$.
- (b) if $k \leq t$ and $\left\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \right\rceil \geq t$, then $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = t$,
- (c) if $-t < k \leq t$ and $\left\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \right\rceil < t$, then $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \right\rceil$,
- (d) if $k \leq -t$ and $\left\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \right\rceil < t$, then $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = \min\{t, 1 + \left\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \right\rceil\}$.

Proof. (a) Let $\{V_t, V_r\}$ be the bi-partition of the vertex set of Γ . Since V_r is a global offensive k -alliance, we only need to show that for every global offensive k -alliance S , $V_r \subseteq S$. If $v \in \overline{S}$ it satisfies $\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\overline{S}}(v) + k > t$, in consequence $v \in V_t$. Therefore, $\overline{S} \subseteq V_t$ or, equivalently, $V_r \subseteq S$. Thus, we conclude that $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = r$.

(b) If $k \leq t$, it is clear that V_t is a global offensive k -alliance, then $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \leq t$. We suppose that $\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \rceil \geq t$ and there exists a global offensive k -alliance $S = A \cup B$ such that $A \subseteq V_r$, $B \subseteq V_t$ and $|S| < t$. In such a case, as S is a dominating set, $B \neq \emptyset$. Since S is a global offensive k -alliance, $2|B| \geq t + k$ and $2|A| \geq r + k$. Then we have, $t > |S| \geq \lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \rceil \geq t$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = t$.

(c) In the proof of (b) we have shown that if there exists a global offensive k -alliance S of cardinality $|S| < t$, then $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \rceil$. Taking $A \subset V_r$ of cardinality $\lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil$ and $B \subset V_t$ of cardinality $\lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \rceil$ we obtain a global offensive k -alliance $S = A \cup B$ of cardinality $|S| = \lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{t+k}{2} \rceil$.

(d) Finally, if $S = A \cup B$ where $A \subseteq V_r$, $B \subseteq V_t$, $|A| = \lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil$ and $|B| = 1$, then S is a global offensive k -alliance. Moreover, S is a minimum global offensive k -alliance if and only if $|S| = 1 + \lceil \frac{r+k}{2} \rceil \leq t$. $\square$

3 Global offensive k -alliances and r -dependent sets

A set $S \subseteq V$ is an r -dependent set in Γ if the maximum degree of a vertex in the subgraph $\langle S \rangle$ induced by S is at most r , i.e., $\delta_S(v) \leq r$, $\forall v \in S$. We denote by $\alpha_r(\Gamma)$ the maximum cardinality of an r -dependent set in Γ [4].

Theorem 3.1. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , minimum degree δ and maximum degree Δ .*

- (a) *If S is an r -dependent set in Γ , $r \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2} \rfloor\}$, then $\overline{S}$ is a global offensive $(\delta - 2r)$ -alliance.*
- (b) *If S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ , $k \in \{2 - \Delta, \dots, \Delta\}$, then $\overline{S}$ is a $\lfloor \frac{\Delta-k}{2} \rfloor$ -dependent set.*
- (c) *Let Γ be a δ -regular graph ($\delta > 0$). S is an r -dependent set in Γ , $r \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2} \rfloor\}$, if and only if $\overline{S}$ is a global offensive $(\delta - 2r)$ -alliance.*

Proof. (a) Let S be an r -dependent set in Γ , then $\delta_S(v) \leq r$ for every $v \in S$. Therefore, $\delta_S(v) + \delta \leq 2\delta_S(v) + \delta_{\overline{S}}(v) \leq 2r + \delta_{\overline{S}}(v)$. As a consequence, $\delta_{\overline{S}}(v) \geq \delta_S(v) + \delta - 2r$, for every $v \in S$. That is, $\overline{S}$ is a global offensive $(\delta - 2r)$ -alliance in Γ .

(b) If S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ , then $\delta(v) \geq 2\delta_S(v) + k$ for every $v \in \overline{S}$. As a consequence, $\delta_{\overline{S}}(v) \leq \frac{\delta(v)-k}{2} \leq \frac{\Delta-k}{2}$ for every $v \in \overline{S}$, that is, $\overline{S}$ is a $\lfloor \frac{\Delta-k}{2} \rfloor$ -dependent set in Γ .

(c) The result follows immediately from (a) and (b). $\square$

Corollary 3.2. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , minimum degree δ and maximum degree Δ .*

- *For every $k \in \{2 - \Delta, \dots, \Delta\}$, $n - \alpha_{\lfloor \frac{\Delta-k}{2} \rfloor}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_k^o(\Gamma)$.*
- *For every $k \in \{1, \dots, \delta\}$, $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \leq n - \alpha_{\lfloor \frac{\delta-k}{2} \rfloor}(\Gamma)$.*
- *If Γ is a δ -regular graph ($\delta > 0$), for every $k \in \{1, \dots, \delta\}$, $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) = n - \alpha_{\lfloor \frac{\delta-k}{2} \rfloor}(\Gamma)$.*

4 Global offensive k -alliances and τ -dominating sets

Let Γ be a graph without isolated vertices. For a given $\tau \in (0, 1]$, a set $S \subseteq V$ is called τ -dominating set in Γ if $\delta_S(v) \geq \tau\delta(v)$ for every $v \in \overline{S}$. We denote by $\gamma_\tau(\Gamma)$ the minimum cardinality of a τ -dominating set in Γ [2].

Theorem 4.1. *Let Γ be a graph of minimum degree $\delta > 0$ and maximum degree Δ .*

- (a) *If $0 < \tau \leq \min\{\frac{k+\delta}{2\delta}, \frac{k+\Delta}{2\Delta}\}$, then every global offensive k -alliance in Γ is a τ -dominating set.*
- (b) *If $\max\{\frac{k+\delta}{2\delta}, \frac{k+\Delta}{2\Delta}\} \leq \tau \leq 1$, then every τ -dominating set in Γ is a global offensive k -alliance.*

Proof. (a) If S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ , then $2\delta_S(v) \geq \delta(v) + k$ for every $v \in \overline{S}$. Therefore, if $0 < \tau \leq \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k+\delta}{2\delta}\}$, then $\delta_S(v) \geq \frac{\delta(v)+k}{2} \geq$

$\frac{\delta(v)+\delta(2\tau-1)}{2} \geq \tau\delta(v)$. Moreover, if $\frac{1}{2} \leq \tau \leq \frac{k+\Delta}{2\Delta}$, then $\delta_S(v) \geq \frac{\delta(v)+k}{2} \geq \frac{\delta(v)+\Delta(2\tau-1)}{2} \geq \tau\delta(v)$.

(b) Since $\delta > 0$, it is clear that every τ -dominating set is a dominating set. If $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\delta(2\tau-1) \leq \delta(v)(2\tau-1)$, for every vertex v in Γ . Hence, if S is a τ -dominating set and $\frac{k+\delta}{2\delta} \leq \tau$, we have $k \leq (2\tau-1)\delta(v) \leq 2\delta_S(v) - \delta(v)$, for every $v \in S$. Thus, S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ .

On the other hand, if $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\Delta(2\tau-1) \leq \delta(v)(2\tau-1)$, for every vertex v in Γ . Hence, if S is a τ -dominating set and $\frac{k+\Delta}{2\Delta} \leq \tau$, we have $k \leq (2\tau-1)\delta(v) \leq 2\delta_S(v) - \delta(v)$, for every $v \in S$. Thus, S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ . $\square$

Corollary 4.2. *S is a global offensive (0)-alliance in Γ if, and only if, S is a $(\frac{1}{2})$ -dominating set.*

Corollary 4.3. *S is a global offensive k -alliance in a δ -regular graph Γ if, and only if, S is a $(\frac{k+\delta}{2\delta})$ -dominating set in Γ .*

Theorem 4.4. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , minimum degree $\delta > 0$ and maximum degree $\Delta \geq 2$. For every $j \in \{2 - \Delta, \dots, 0\}$ and $k \leq -\frac{j\delta}{\Delta}$ it is satisfied $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) + \gamma_j^o(\Gamma) \leq n$.*

Proof. If $j \in \{2 - \Delta, \dots, 0\}$, then there exists $\tau \in [\frac{1}{\Delta}, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $j = \Delta(2\tau-1)$. Therefore, if S is a τ -dominating set, then (by Theorem 4.1 (b)) S is a global offensive j -alliance. In consequence, $\gamma_j^o(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_\tau(\Gamma)$. Moreover, if $k \leq -\frac{j\delta}{\Delta} = \delta(1-2\tau)$, then $1-\tau \geq \max\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k+\delta}{2\delta}\}$. Hence, by Theorem 4.1 (b), we have that every $(1-\tau)$ -dominating set is a global offensive k -alliance. Thus, $\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_{1-\tau}(\Gamma)$. Using that $\gamma_\tau(\Gamma) + \gamma_{1-\tau}(\Gamma) \leq n$ for $0 < \tau < 1$ (see Theorem 9 [2]), we obtain the required result. $\square$

Notice that from Theorem 4.4 we have the following result.

Corollary 4.5. *If Γ is a graph of order n and minimum degree $\delta > 0$, then $\gamma_0^o(\Gamma) \leq \frac{n}{2}$.*

5 Global offensive k -alliances and standard dominating sets

We say that a global offensive k -alliance S is *minimal* if no proper subset $S' \subset S$ is a global offensive k -alliance.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Γ be a graph without isolated vertices and $k \leq 1$. If S is a minimal global offensive k -alliance in Γ , then $\bar{S}$ is a dominating set in Γ .*

Proof. We suppose there exists $u \in S$ such that $\delta_{\bar{S}}(u) = 0$ and let $S' = S \setminus \{u\}$. Since S is a minimal global offensive k -alliance, and Γ has no isolated vertices, there exists $v \in \bar{S}'$ such that $\delta_{S'}(v) < \delta_{\bar{S}'}(v) + k$. If $v = u$, we have $\delta_S(u) = \delta_{S'}(u) < \delta_{\bar{S}'}(u) + k = k$, a contradiction. If $v \neq u$, we have $\delta_S(v) = \delta_{S'}(v) < \delta_{\bar{S}'}(v) + k = \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k$, which is a contradiction too. Thus, $\delta_{\bar{S}}(u) > 0$ for every $u \in S$. $\square$

In the following result $\bar{\Gamma} = (V, \bar{E})$ denotes the complement of $\Gamma = (V, E)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let Γ be a graph of order n . A dominating set S in $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a global offensive k -alliance in $\bar{\Gamma}$ if and only if $\delta_S(v) - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + n + k - 1 \leq 2|S|$ for every $v \in \bar{S}$.*

Proof. We know that a dominating set S in $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a global offensive k -alliance in $\bar{\Gamma}$ if and only if $\bar{\delta}_S(v) \geq \bar{\delta}_{\bar{S}}(v) + k$ for every $v \in \bar{S}$, where $\bar{\delta}_S(v)$ and $\bar{\delta}_{\bar{S}}(v)$ denote the number of vertices that v has in S and $\bar{S}$, respectively, in $\bar{\Gamma}$. Now, using that $\bar{\delta}_S(v) = |S| - \delta_S(v)$ and $\bar{\delta}_{\bar{S}}(v) = |\bar{S}| - 1 - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) = n - |S| - 1 - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v)$, we get that S is a global offensive k -alliance in $\bar{\Gamma}$ if and only if $|S| - \delta_S(v) \geq n - |S| - 1 + k - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v)$ or, equivalently, if $\delta_S(v) - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + n + k - 1 \leq 2|S|$ for every $v \in \bar{S}$. $\square$

Theorem 5.3. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , minimum degree δ and maximum degree Δ .*

- (a) *Every dominating set in $\bar{\Gamma} = (V, \bar{E})$, $S \subseteq V$, of cardinality $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{n+k+\Delta-1}{2} \rceil$ is a global offensive k -alliance in $\bar{\Gamma}$.*
- (b) *Every dominating set in $\Gamma = (V, E)$, $S \subseteq V$, of cardinality $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{2n+k-\delta-2}{2} \rceil$ is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ .*

Proof. If S is a dominating set in $\bar{\Gamma}$ and it satisfies $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{n+k+\Delta-1}{2} \rceil$, then

$$|S| \geq \frac{n+k+\Delta-1}{2} \geq \frac{\delta_S(v) - \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + n + k - 1}{2}$$

for every vertex v . Therefore, by Lemma 5.2 we have that S is a global offensive k -alliance in $\bar{\Gamma}$. Thus, the result (a) follows.

Analogously, by replacing Γ by $\bar{\Gamma}$ and taking into account that the maximum degree in $\bar{\Gamma}$ is $n - 1 - \delta$, the result (b) follows. $\square$

6 The Cartesian product of k -alliances

In this section we discuss the close relationship that exist among the (global) offensive k_i -alliance number of Γ_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and the (global) offensive k -alliance number of $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$, for some specific values of k .

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\Gamma_i = (V_i, E_i)$ be a graph of minimum degree δ_i and maximum degree Δ_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

- (a) *If S_i is an offensive k_i -alliance in Γ_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then, for $k = \min\{k_2 - \Delta_1, k_1 - \Delta_2\}$, $S_1 \times S_2$ is an offensive k -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$.*
- (b) *Let $S_i \subset V_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $S_1 \times S_2$ is an offensive k -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$, then S_1 is an offensive $(k + \delta_2)$ -alliance in Γ_1 and S_2 is an offensive $(k + \delta_1)$ -alliance in Γ_2 , moreover, $k \leq \min\{\Delta_1 - \delta_2, \Delta_2 - \delta_1\}$.*

Proof. If $X = S_1 \times S_2$, then $(u, v) \in \partial X$ if and only if, either $u \in \partial S_1$ and $v \in S_2$ or $u \in S_1$ and $v \in \partial S_2$. We differentiate two cases:

Case 1: If $u \in \partial S_1$ and $v \in S_2$, then $\delta_X(u, v) = \delta_{S_1}(u)$ and $\delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) = \delta_{\overline{S_1}}(u) + \delta(v)$.

Case 2: If $u \in S_1$ and $v \in \partial S_2$, then $\delta_X(u, v) = \delta_{S_2}(v)$ and $\delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) = \delta(u) + \delta_{\overline{S_2}}(v)$.

- (a) In Case 1 we have $\delta_X(u, v) = \delta_{S_1}(u) \geq \delta_{\overline{S_1}}(u) + k_1 = \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) - \delta(v) + k_1 \geq \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) - \Delta_2 + k_1$ and in Case 2 we obtain $\delta_X(u, v) = \delta_{S_2}(v) \geq \delta_{\overline{S_2}}(v) + k_2 = \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) - \delta(u) + k_2 \geq \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) - \Delta_1 + k_2$. Hence, for every $(u, v) \in \partial X$, $\delta_X(u, v) \geq \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) + k$, with $k = \min\{k_2 - \Delta_1, k_1 - \Delta_2\}$. So, the result follows.
- (b) In Case 1 we have $\delta_{S_1}(u) = \delta_X(u, v) \geq \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) + k = \delta_{\overline{S_1}}(u) + \delta(v) + k = \delta_{\overline{S_1}}(u) + \delta_2 + k$ and in Case 2 we deduce $\delta_{S_2}(v) = \delta_X(u, v) \geq \delta_{\overline{X}}(u, v) + k = \delta_{\overline{S_2}}(v) + \delta(u) + k \geq \delta_{\overline{S_2}}(v) + \delta_1 + k$. Hence, for every $u \in \partial S_1$, $\delta_{S_1}(u) \geq \delta_{\overline{S_1}}(u) + \delta_1 + k$ and for every $v \in \partial S_2$, $\delta_{S_2}(v) \geq \delta_{\overline{S_2}}(v) + \delta_2 + k$. So, the result follows.

□

Corollary 6.2. *Let Γ_i be a graph of maximum degree Δ_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then for every $k \leq \min\{k_1 - \Delta_2, k_2 - \Delta_1\}$, $a_k^o(\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2) \leq a_{k_1}^o(\Gamma_1)a_{k_2}^o(\Gamma_2)$.*

For the particular case of the graph $C_4 \times K_4$, we have $a_{-3}^o(C_4 \times K_4) = 2 = a_0^o(C_4)a_1^o(K_4)$.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\Gamma_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be a graph of maximum degree Δ_2 and minimum degree δ_2 .*

- (i) *If S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ_1 , then $S \times V_2$ is a global offensive $(k - \Delta_2)$ -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$.*
- (ii) *If $S \times V_2$ is a global offensive k -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$, then S is a global offensive $(k + \delta_2)$ -alliance in Γ_1 , moreover, $k \leq \Delta_1 - \delta_2$, where Δ_1 denotes the maximum degree of Γ_1 .*

Proof.

- (i) We first note that, as S is a dominating set in Γ_1 , $X = S \times V_2$ is a dominating set in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$. In addition, for every $x_{ij} = (u_i, v_j) \in \bar{X}$ we have $\delta_X(x_{ij}) = \delta_S(u_i)$ and $\delta_{\bar{S}}(u_i) + \Delta_2 \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(u_i) + \delta(v_j) = \delta_{\bar{X}}(x_{ij})$, so $\delta_X(x_{ij}) = \delta_S(u_i) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(u_i) + k \geq \delta_{\bar{X}}(x_{ij}) - \Delta_2 + k$. Thus, X is a global offensive $(k - \Delta_2)$ -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$.
- (ii) From Theorem 6.1 (a) we obtain that S is an offensive $(k + \delta_2)$ -alliance in Γ_1 and $k \leq \Delta_1 - \delta_2$. We only need to show that S is a dominating set. As $S \times V_2$ is a dominating set in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$, we have that for every $u \in \bar{S}$ and $v \in V_2$ there exists $(a, b) \in S \times V_2$ such that (a, b) is adjacent to (u, v) , hence, $b = v$ and a is adjacent to u , so the result follows.

□

It is easy to see the following result on domination, $\gamma(\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2) \leq n_2 \gamma(\Gamma_1)$, where n_2 is the order of Γ_2 . An “analogous” result on global offensive k -alliances can be deduced from Theorem 6.3 (i).

Corollary 6.4. *For any graph Γ_1 and any graph Γ_2 of order n_2 and maximum degree Δ_2 , $\gamma_{k-\Delta_2}^o(\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2) \leq n_2 \gamma_k^o(\Gamma_1)$.*

We emphasize the following particular cases of Corollary 6.4.

Remark 6.5. *For any graph Γ ,*

- (a) $\gamma_{k-2}^o(\Gamma \times C_t) \leq t \gamma_k^o(\Gamma)$,

$$(b) \quad \gamma_{k-2}^o(\Gamma \times P_t) \leq t\gamma_k^o(\Gamma).$$

$$(c) \quad \gamma_{k-t+1}^o(\Gamma \times K_t) \leq t\gamma_k^o(\Gamma).$$

Notice also that if Γ_2 is a regular graph, Theorem 6.3 (i) can be simplified as follow.

Corollary 6.6. *Let $\Gamma_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be a δ -regular graph. A set S is a global offensive k -alliance in Γ_1 if and only if $S \times V_2$ is a global offensive $(k - \delta)$ -alliance in $\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$.*

7 Bounding the global offensive k -alliance number

In general, the problem of finding the global offensive k -alliance number is NP-complete [5]. In the following results we obtain some bounds on this number involving some other parameters of the graphs.

Remark 7.1. *For every $k \in \{4 - n, \dots, n - 1\}$,*

$$(a) \quad \left\lceil \frac{t(n+k-3)}{2} \right\rceil \leq \gamma_k^o(K_n \times C_t) \leq t \left\lceil \frac{n+k+1}{2} \right\rceil,$$

$$(b) \quad \left\lceil \frac{t(n+k-3)+2}{2} \right\rceil \leq \gamma_k^o(K_n \times P_t) \leq t \left\lceil \frac{n+k+1}{2} \right\rceil$$

Proof. (a) Let $S = \cup_{i=1}^t S_i \subset V(K_n \times C_t)$, where each S_i ($1 \leq i \leq t$) is a subset of each one of the t copies of K_n , respectively. If S is a global offensive k -alliance in $K_n \times C_t$, then for every $v \in \bar{S}$ we have, $|S_i| + 2 \geq \delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k \geq n - 1 - |S_i| + k$, where S_i is the corresponding subset of S included in the same copy of K_n containing v . Thus, $|S_i| \geq \frac{n+k-3}{2}$. Hence, for $k > 3 - n$, we obtain that $S_i \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $|S| = \sum_{i=1}^t |S_i| \geq \frac{t(n+k-3)}{2}$. The upper bound is obtained directly from Remark 6.5. The proof of (b) is completely analogous. $\square$

Theorem 7.2. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , size m , minimum degree δ and maximum degree Δ . For every $k \in \{2 - \delta, \dots, \delta\}$, the following inequality holds*

$$\gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{(n + 2\Delta + k) - \sqrt{(n + 2\Delta + k)^2 - 4(2m + kn)}}{2} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. To get the bound, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
2m &= \sum_{v \in S} \delta(v) + \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} \delta_S(v) + \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} \delta_{\overline{S}}(v) \\
&\leq 2|S|\Delta + \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} (\delta_S(v) - k) \\
&\leq 2|S|\Delta + (n - |S|)(|S| - k).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the result follows by solving the inequality $|S|^2 - (n + 2\Delta + k)|S| + 2m + kn \leq 0$. $\square$

Notice the bound is tight, if we consider the cube Q_3 we obtain $\gamma_{-1}^o(Q_3) = \gamma(Q_3) = 2$ and $\gamma_2^o(Q_3) = \gamma_3^o(Q_3) = 4$.

The upper bound in the following theorem have been correctly obtained in [5] but it appears in the article with a mistake, should be $\lfloor \frac{\delta-k+2}{2} \rfloor$ instead of $\lceil \frac{\delta-k+2}{2} \rceil$. So in this article we include the correct result without proof. The lower bound is an immediate generalization of the previous results obtained in [15] for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$.

Theorem 7.3. *Let Γ be a graph of order n , size m and maximum degree Δ . Then*

$$\left\lceil \frac{2m + kn}{3\Delta + k} \right\rceil \leq \gamma_k^o(\Gamma) \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta - k + 2}{2} \right\rfloor$$

The bounds of Theorem 7.3 are tight. For instance, the lower bound is attained in the case of the 3-cube, Q_3 , for every k . The upper bound is attained, for instance, for the complete graph, K_n , for every k , i.e., $\gamma_k^o(K_n) = \lceil \frac{n+k-1}{2} \rceil$.

There are graphs in which Theorem 7.2 leads to better results than the lower bound in Theorem 7.3 and viceversa. For instance, for $k = 1$ and $\Gamma = K_5$ the bound in Theorem 7.2 is attained but the lower bound in Theorem 7.3 is not. The opposite one occurs for the case of the 3-cube graph.

Corollary 7.4. *Let $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)$ be the line graph of a simple graph Γ of size m . Let $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \dots \geq \delta_n$ be the degree sequence of Γ . Then*

$$\gamma_k^o(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)) \geq \left\lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i^2 + m(k-2)}{3(\delta_1 + \delta_2 - 2) + k} \right\rceil.$$

Theorem 7.5. *Let Γ be a graph of order n and maximum degree Δ . For all global offensive k -alliance S in Γ such that the subgraph $\langle \overline{S} \rangle$ has minimum degree p , $|S| \geq \left\lceil \frac{(p+k)n}{\Delta+p+k} \right\rceil$.*

Proof. The number of edges in the subgraph $\langle \overline{S} \rangle$ satisfies $m(\langle \overline{S} \rangle) \geq \frac{(n-|S|)p}{2}$, hence,

$$\Delta|S| \geq \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} \delta_S(v) \geq \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} \delta_{\overline{S}}(v) + k(n-|S|) = 2m(\langle \overline{S} \rangle) + k(n-|S|) \geq (p+k)(n-|S|),$$

in consequence, $|S| \geq \frac{(p+k)n}{\Delta+p+k}$. $\square$

Notice the bound is attained for the minimal global offensive k -alliance in the case of the 3-cube graph Q_3 for $k = -1, 2, 3$. For $k = -1$ we have $|S| = 2$ and $p = 2$, and for $k = 2, 3$ we have $|S| = 4$ and $p = 0$.

References

- [1] R. C. Brigham, R. D. Dutton, T. W. Haynes, and S. T. Hedetniemi, Powerful alliances in graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*. To appear 2008.
- [2] J.E. Dunbar, D.G. Hoffman, R.C. Laskar and L.R. Markus, α -Domination. *Discrete mathematics* **211** (2000) 11–26.
- [3] O. Favaron, G. Fricke, W. Goddard, S. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi, P. Kristiansen, R.C. Laskar and R.D. Skaggs, Offensive alliances in graphs. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* **24** (2) (2004) 263–275.
- [4] O. Favaron, S. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, On k -dependent domination. *Discrete mathematics* **249** (2002) 83–94.
- [5] H. Fernau, J. A. Rodríguez and J. M. Sigarreta, Offensive k -alliances in graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **157** (1) (2009) 177–182.
- [6] P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi, Alliances in graphs. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **48** (2004) 157–177.
- [7] M. Lu, H. Liu and F. Tian, Bounds of Laplacian spectrum of graphs based on the domination number. *Linear Algebra and its applications* **402** (2005) 390–396.

- [8] J. A. Rodríguez, H. Fernau and J. M. Sigarreta, Powerful r -alliances and total k -domination in graphs. submitted 2008.
- [9] J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez, I. G. Yero and J. M. Sigarreta, Defensive k -alliances in graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letter* **22** (2009) 96-100.
- [10] J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez and J.M. Sigarreta, Global defensive k -alliances in graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **157** (2) (2009) 211-218.
- [11] J. A. Rodríguez and J.M. Sigarreta, Offensive alliances in cubic graphs. *International Mathematical Forum* **1** (36) (2006) 1773–1782.
- [12] K. H. Shafique and R.D. Dutton, Maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *Congr. Numer.* **162** (2003) 139–146.
- [13] K.H. Shafique and R.D. Dutton, A tight bound on the cardinalities of maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **56** (2006) 139–145.
- [14] J. M. Sigarreta and J.A. Rodríguez, On defensive alliances and line graphs. *Applied Mathematic Letters* **19** (2) (2006) 1345-1350.
- [15] J. M. Sigarreta and J.A. Rodríguez, On the global offensive alliance number of a graph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **157** (2) (2009) 219-226.